

A LETTER

TO

THE SECRETARY TO THE
CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY,

RE:

THE SYRIAN CHURCH ENDOWMENT

A RE-JOINDER.

—:O:—

ERNAKULAM:

PRINTED AT THE VIDYA VILASUM

1903.

To

**THE SECRETARY TO THE
CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY,
SALISBURY SQUARE,
LONDON.**

REVEREND SIR,

I thank you and the C. M. S. Committee for the copy of the memorandum, sent to me through the Secretary to your Corresponding Committee in Madras, in reply to my letter addressed to him, regarding the Syrian endowments. Your memorandum was duly laid before the Jacobite Syrian Association in a special meeting convened for the purpose; and after mature consideration, they have unanimously passed the following resolutions (among others):—

- (1) "We regret to find that the C. M. S. have not adequately dealt with the Syrian endowment question, so as to convince us either that the claims advanced by Mr. Philip in behalf of the Syrian Church are unfounded, or that the Missionaries have a lawful right to hold the endowments and administer them in the manner in which they now do.
- (2) "Fully aware of the perils and dangers that attend a litigation with so influential a body as the C. M. S., but in firm confidence that the Almighty God, who preserved the Church of His Apostle St. Thomas through the adverse vicissitudes of nineteen centuries, will plead the just cause of this oppressed branch of His Church Catholic, we are reluctantly obliged to record that the denial of the claims of the Syrian Church by the C. M. S. and the unconvincing arguments advanced in support of the denial leave to the Syrian Community no other alternative but to take legal action.
- (3) "As, however, the Syrian Church is loath to take extreme measures except after failure of all possible attempt to have the dispute amicably settled, and as the C. M. S. Committee evidently appear to have misunderstood or been misinformed on many of the points at issue, we have, after mature consideration, arrived at the conclusion that

before taking legal steps, one more endeavour should be made to induce the C. M. S. to come to terms; and we, therefore, request the Secretary to this Association to submit to the C. M. S. Committee a rejoinder to their memorandum, as a last attempt to evade, if possible, the unpleasant, unbecoming and uncharitable procedure of litigating with that eminent body, with the firm hope that the venerable Society will not fail to do full justice to the Syrian Church when they reconsider the position, attitude and dealings of their Missionaries with the light of the rejoinder."

2. In pursuance of the above resolutions, I address you again in reply to your memorandum, and I hope you will kindly excuse me in so doing.

3. Your memorandum begins with a statement of the present state of the ancient Syrian Church from your point of view, and then discusses in some detail the circumstances which brought about a union between it and the C. M. S., the joint administration of the endowments, the subsequent disruption which led to the arbitration of 1840, and the terms of the award on the several items in dispute. The sum and substance of your arguments are:—

- (1) That the Syrian Metran did not formally appeal against the award;
- (2) That the award is final and valid;
- (3) That the Metran did not make a proper application in time to a Court of Justice;
- (4) That he accepted the items awarded in his favour;
- (5) That the endowments were lawfully entrusted to, and are lawfully held by, your Missionaries; and
- (6) That the present system of the administration of the endowments is in accordance with the terms of the original trust.

4. I shall now deal with these arguments and the evidences relied on to support them, and show how far from convincing they are, and how unlikely it is that they will serve to induce the Syrian Church to give up their claims.

5. Your first argument is that "the statement in Mr. Philip's letter that the Syrian Metran appealed against the award is incorrect," (para 43). But in the same breath, you admit that he "complained to the Government of the terms of the award." Your contention appears to be that the alleged appeal was not a formal appeal. On this point, the Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras who had the appeal and all other papers before him is, I think, a better authority than the authors of the C. M. S. memorandum. In his memo dated 18th November 1853, the Chief Secretary writes: "Against this award the Syrian Metran appealed." Whether it was a formal appeal or an informal complaint, it cannot be doubted that the Government regarded it at the time as a formal appeal, inasmuch as it deserved the special consideration and interference of the Government and the Hon'ble Court of Directors, as will be shown later on. It has also to be considered in this connection that the alleged reference to arbitration was not in pursuance of any order of a judicial tribunal, but was the result of the interference of the British Resident, and that the Syrian Metran did appeal to those in authority over that functionary.

6. The second contention raised in your memorandum is that the award of the arbitrators is final and valid; and your argument on this point is that the finding of the Court of Directors is simply an opinion having no binding force, and you claim that "neither the Resident nor the Government nor the Court of Directors *had* or *assumed to have* any jurisdiction to annul the award," and that the award was recognised by the Government as a final adjudication of the whole matter; and in support of this argument, you quote from the minute of consultation dated 13th July 1840, a statement that the question "ought now to be considered as finally adjudicated." (Paras 44, 45 and 46 of the memorandum).

7. In reply to this, I have only to refer you to the rulings of the Government and the Court of Directors on the point. As already shown, the Metran appealed against the award, and then, though the Government declined to interfere in the matter and recorded the minute of consultation quoted above, the Court of Directors to whom the appeal was carried, overruled the proceedings both of the arbitrators and of the Government of Madras, and held that the contention should be settled by a Court of Justice. The action of the Resident in disbursing the funds adjudged to the Missionaries was strongly condemned, and it was definitely ordered that the amount received by the Missionaries should be refunded. It was further observed by the Government that "the course appeared to be not only the most becoming under the circumstances of the case, but *indispensable* in the absence of the Hon'ble Court's sanction to the proceedings of the arbitrators." Here you see not only that the Government and the Court of Directors *assumed to have* full jurisdiction to annul the award, but they actually annulled it. The refund of the fund by the C. M. S. and a civil suit by the aggrieved party were, in the opinion of the Government, "*indispensable* in the absence of the Hon'ble Court's sanction." In other words, the award and the disposal of the property in pursuance of the award were declared illegal and ineffectual, and the Government of Madras treated the decision of the Hon'ble Court as the one final. (See the references in pp. 12 and 13 of my previous letter).

8. I shall next show that the Government and the Court of Directors *had* the authority to annul the award. In this connection, it must be borne in mind that the arbitration was formed under the orders of the Government and with the sanction of the Court of Directors. What is the law as regards arbitrations formed under the orders of a Civil Court? No award is final until it is ratified by a decree of the Court under whose orders the arbitration is held, and the Court that ordered arbitration has the jurisdiction, if sufficient cause be shown, to *modify, correct or set aside* the award. If so, it cannot be argued for a moment that the Government of Madras and the Court of Directors, under whose orders the arbitration in question was formed, had no

power to annul the award. It was not in the power of the Syrians or the C. M. S. to decide whether the reasons adduced for or against the award were valid or not. The Government and the Court of Directors had that power, and they actually annulled it. You cannot say a word against it.

9. Again, it has to be remembered that no award of arbitrators appointed under the order of a Civil Court can be executed before it is ratified and embodied in a decree of Court. The action of the Resident in disbursing the disputed fund to the C. M. S., before obtaining the final sanction of the supreme authority, was itself objectionable and unlawful. The Government characterises his action as a "precipitate disposal of the property." (Vide p. 13 of my former letter). Suppose the Resident adhered to the letter of the law and waited for the final order of the supreme authority for disbursement of the fund to the C. M. S. Was it possible for the C. M. S. to get possession of the funds without a civil action, simply by claiming that the award was final, or could they get the decretal part of the award executed, in spite of the decision of the Court of Directors to the contrary? No, not at all. Now, a final decision is one that can be executed without any objection. The award in question was not such, when annulled by the Court of Directors; and it was, therefore, neither final nor valid.

10. Your next argument is a plain question of law. You contend that the Metran having failed within a reasonable time "to make a proper application by way of appeal to a Court of Justice, it may be assumed that he had no sufficient ground for any such application" (para 46). This, in the language of Law, is what is called the bar by limitation. In the first place, I should observe that the bar by limitation is not a theory suited to true Christianity. The law of God does not recognise limitation as a plea against delivery of properties to a lawful owner, if sufficient proof of ownership is given. Coming, as it does, from a venerable Society pledged to spread the law of God throughout the world, the contention looks strange and awkward. Secondly, where is the room for the plea here? An award was pronounced by the arbitrators. It would operate as a final decision, if ratified by the authorities under whose orders the arbitration was held. The

civil court was not open to the Syrian Metran unless until he could show that the award was annulled by the supreme authorities. Hence he appealed to the Government and the Court of Directors. Though they set aside the award, the fact was not intimated to him, because they required the C. M. S. to refund the money received by them, before the parties could be directed to go to law. The C. M. S. raised all sorts of objections, and thus the final decision of the Government and the Court of Directors was withheld from the knowledge of the Metran. Where, then, was the scope for litigation? Is it the Syrian Metran that should be blamed for not taking legal action? To speak the truth, it was the designs and machinations of the C. M. S. authorities that prolonged the dispute so long, and prevented the Government from giving intimation of the fact to the Syrian Metran. (See paras 28, 32, 34 and 35 of my previous letter).

11. Again, I ask where is the room for limitation here? Your Missionaries are trustees of the endowments, and one of the causes of action against them is breach of trust. But no suit against a trustee in respect of a trust is barred by any length of time.

12. "That the Syrian Metran accepted the items awarded in his favour" is another argument advanced in your memorandum (para 50). I have sufficiently explained in paragraph 37 of my letter that the alleged acceptance does not bind the Syrian community. The Metran of the Syrian Church on the date of the award was Mar Dionysius Chepat. That he declined to draw his share of the funds as adjudged by the arbitrators, and that he appealed against the award and continued to petition the Government, are matters which nobody can dispute. Even the Missionaries have admitted them. (Vide Mr. Baker's letter referred to in page 16, footnote of my former letter). His successor Mar Mathew Athanasius followed the footsteps of Mar Dionysius as long as he was the recognised bishop of the Syrians, (Vide Resident Cullen's letter of the 23rd September 1853, No. 318). In 1870, when he found or supposed that he was superseded by another bishop, the present Mar Dionysius, the C. M. S.

avail'd themselves of the opportunity to get his consent to the award by pretending to support him; and by exercising their influence through the then Bishop of Madras, they succeeded in inducing the Resident to hand over the fund to him, in spite of the objection raised by the community. (*Vide* para 57 of the previous letter). The following extract from a published letter addressed to the Bishop of Madras by the then Missionary, the late Rev. Henry Baker, Junior, clearly shows the extent of the influence exercised by your Missionaries, to force the award upon a dismissed Bishop of the Syrian Church. He writes:—"I am happy to be able to tell Your Lordship that the Madras Government has consented to the payment of the Travancore endowment, so long in abeyance.....I feel that Your Lordship's kindness in *pressing the matter upon him* (i. e. Mr. Ballard, the then Resident) has been the means under God of putting things so far straight." (*Vide* Colonial Church Chronicles of November 1870, p. 439). This shows how your local Missionaries under the guise of doing a service to the Syrian Bishops, served their own end of securing some evidence of acceptance by the latter of the terms of the award.

13. Again, a mere assertion on your part that the Syrian Metran accepted the award, without impeaching the circumstances explained in my letter, cannot, of course, shake my position, and I still challenge you to prove that the Syrian community accepted the share awarded to them, after having been fully informed of the final decision of the Government and the Court of Directors, annulling the proceedings of the arbitration. It has further to be borne in mind that according to the sworn deposition of the co-trustees of Mar Athanasius, they conformed to the terms of the award, only in respect of two items of funds with which they had to deal directly with the Resident, and not in respect of any other.

14. The next point I have to consider is the contention raised in para 52 of your memorandum. You admit that the C. M. S. have no proprietary or beneficiary right in the property and fund in question, but you claim that "these have been lawfully entrusted to and are lawfully held" by your Missionaries

as trustees, and that, as such trustees, you have the right to control and administer them "to the exclusion from such control and administration of the Metran and his successors and of all other persons." I strongly deny this assertion. As already shown, you got possession of the property and fund by the execution of the award, before it became a final decision, or in the words of the Government of Madras, by "precipitate disposal." A possession thus got was void *ab initio*. You hold them defying the repeated orders of competent authorities which demanded you to refund the same. How then can you say that they were *lawfully* entrusted to and are *lawfully* held by you? I should call the entrustment and possession a kind of technical usurpation, though I am very sorry to use that word.

15. I now come to the last and important contention raised in your memorandum, *viz* that the present system of the administration of the endowment by your Missionaries entirely accords with the terms of the trust. (Paras 53 to 75 of the memorandum.) Your arguments on this point are for the most part based on the terms of the award. But the award, as already shown, is not a final decision, and so conclusion can be drawn from the views of the arbitrators, unless corroborated by other evidences. According to the award, "the grand object contemplated by Col. Munro, (the British Resident), was the political, moral, and religious renovation of the whole of the Syrian people through the instruction of the English Missionaries." Assuming for the sake of argument that this was the real object of the endowment in question, we have to consider whether the present system of your administration of the trust agrees with this object. To enable one to arrive at a right conclusion, one has also to consider what were the schemes of renovation contemplated by Col. Munro and the object which the C. M. S. had in sending their Missionaries for work among the Syrians—in fact the object which they intimated to the Syrian Bishop and accepted by him before the work commenced.

16. As regards the object of the C. M. S. you admit that it was "to benefit the Syrian Church—not to amalgamate it with the Church of England—not to interfere with its liberty to ordain

rites and ceremonics, but to encourage and aid it to reform itself." (Para 7 of the Memorandum). Reform or renovation is a word applied to improvements or changes of any kind in any department of religion, society and politics. No religion, however conservative, will deny the necessity of certain reforms suitable to time and circumstance in every age. Even the Church of Rome carries on reforms of a certain nature in all its departments. But in religious matters, there is a limit beyond which reform and renovation cannot go. Hence it is also important to look into the nature and limit of the reforms contemplated by Col. Munro in his alleged phrase, "religious renovation," and by the C. M. S. in their expression, "to reform itself."

17. The Rev. Thomas Norton, who was your first Missionary in Travancore, in describing his first introduction to the Syrian Metran, writes:—"It appears that some misapprehension existed in his (Metran's) mind, and much more in the minds of the clergy and people, lest we should innovate and endeavour to do away with some of their legitimate rites and bring them under English ecclesiastical power. Indeed this fear so possessed the minds of a few that they have actually left the Syrian and joined the Romish Church, intimating that the Bishop was about to betray them to the English. I endeavoured, therefore, in the first place to convince the Metropolitan in the presence of several of his Catanars that we had no other object in view than the benefit of the Syrian Church; and assured him that it was our *sole* desire to be instrumental, by the Divine assistance, in strengthening his hands for *removing those evils which they had derived from the Church of Rome, and which he himself lamented*, and to bring them back to their primitive state, according to the purity of the Gospel, that they might again become a holy and vigorous church active and useful in the cause of God. I have reason to be thankful that, after a little conversation, I succeeded; and he received me, as he expressed himself, as one sent by the Lord to be their redeemer and protector, and prayed that God would bless my efforts among them." (Vide "Missionary Enterprize in the East," by the Rev. R. Collins, late Principal of the C. M. S. College, Kottayam, pp. 98 and 99.)

18. Here we have an express proposal and acceptance of the condition of union and reform. The *sole* aim of the C. M. S. was to help the Metran in removing the evils which had been derived from the Church of Rome—evils which the Metran and his Church lamented. This, no doubt, was the limit of the reform contemplated by the C. M. S. and accepted by the Syrian Church. Let us next see what the reform contemplated by Col. Munro was. "The establishment," he writes in one of his reports, "of an efficient system of education at the College, the translation of the Bible, and the strict enforcement of ecclesiastical discipline," were, in his opinion, the chief and important requisites "for the reformation of the Syrians." (*Vide* "Proceedings of the C. M. S. for Africa and the East, twentieth year 1819—1820," p. 186). About the Syrian Church itself his opinion was that it was "a bright monument of Christian Truth in the midst of the darkest scenes of idolatry and wickedness." (*Ibid* pp. 172 and 173).

19. As already stated, the reforms contemplated by Col. Munro, according to your showing, were four-fold, *viz.* "political," "moral," and "religious" renovation and "instruction of English Missionaries." In respect of the first, he says that the Syrians were held in former years in high estimation by the native Princes, so much so that "the more Christians a pagan Prince had in his dominions, the more he was feared and esteemed," but that at the time he was speaking of, the Syrians had become an object of oppression. He, therefore, desired to "restore them to the high station which they formerly occupied." (*Vide* *Ibid* pp. 339 to 346). With regard to the second, he found the Syrians in a very low state of morality. Even some of the priests were leading a bad life. (*Vide* extract from Munro's letter quoted in the "Friend of Malabar," the vernacular organ of the C. M. S. published at Kottayam, Vol. IX. p. 74). Concerning the third item of reform, *viz.* religious renovation, his view was exactly the same which Mr. Norton proposed to the Metran, *viz.* the removal of evils which had been derived from the Church of Rome. (*Vide* *Ibid* Vol. IX, p. 132). Religious renovation being a part of the object of the endowment, it cannot be denied that the trust was partly religious, and we have seen that the religious

part of the trust comprises *solely* the removal of evils which had crept into the Syrian Church from the Church of Rome, and which the Metran himself was lamenting. Hence the fourth item of reform *viz.* "instruction of English Missionaries" cannot go an inch beyond this limit. Further, it was never the intention of Col. Munro that the education of the Syrians should always remain in the hands of the English Missionaries, for his object in inviting the Missionaries is thus described in one of his reports:—"These people having lost education, courage, and ability, extraneous help is wanted to elevate them; and two Missionaries Bailey and Norton served this purpose." (*Vide Ibid* Vol. IX p. 132). That he did not confide education entirely in the hands of the Missionaries even when he found the Syrians void of learning, courage and ability, is clear from the direction given by him to Mr. Bailey, to invest the grant of Rs. 20,000 on lands and to employ a committee of the principal authorities attached to the College, in the management of all the endowments, (award para 4). The committee, as we see from para 19 of the award, consisted of the Missionary in charge of the College and native Syrians, including of course the Metran, the Syriac Malpans and other priests, so that it is clear that Col. Munro never meant either that the Missionaries should have the sole right of conducting the education of the Syrians, or that the education should always remain in the hands of the Missionaries.

20. Bearing the above facts in mind, I would humbly ask you, sir, to consider whether the present system of the management of the endowments by your Missionaries complies with the terms of the object either contemplated by Col. Munro or proposed and accepted by the C. M. S. and the Syrian Metran respectively.

21. The early work of the Missionaries was in conformity to his plan. "They preached," writes the Rev. R. Collins, "in the Syrian Churches—all of which were open to them—but in no way interfered with the usual services; even the College youths attended daily mass in the chapel.* Thus they endeavoured to

* "The terms *mass* and *mass-service* are entirely unknown to the Syrians, but are gratuitously used by the Missionaries, in order to signify their sense of identity between the Syrian Eucharistic office and the Roman mass." (*Vide Howard's Christians of St. Thomas and their Liturgies*, p. 94, foot note.)

influence the Syrian Church for good, while carefully abstaining from any cause of *Schism*. ("Missionary Enterprize in the East," p. 96). In paras 2 to 21 of my former letter, I have fully described all the incidents connected with the union and separation of the Syrians and the Missionaries, and have clearly shown that the real cause of the disruption was the interference of the Missionaries in matters over and beyond the terms stipulated as conditions of union. I am sorry to find that you intentionally refrain from entering into the justice and accuracy or otherwise of the accounts given in those paras, although they contain vital matters for the determination of the question at issue. The only explanation for your silence that I can conceive of is that they are unassailable. That it is so, I may show by other proofs also.

22. Here is what one of your own Missionaries, the Rev. R. Collins, wrote on the subject. He says that the Missionaries had "arrived at the hasty and incorrect conclusion that everything erroneous in doctrine and practice in the Syrian Church had been derived from their fifty years' subjection to Rome. Never was there a greater mistake. The errors of Syrianism were the errors of Antioch, not Rome. No sooner was the Roman yoke taken off her shoulders than the Syrian Church returned to her old liturgies and her old faith, under the auspices of a bishop, commissioned to this work by the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch himself. The false teachings and customs of the Syrian Church were not mere excrescences, grafted on to an otherwise pure stock by Rome, and which needed only to be pointed out in order to their speedy excision; they were entwined amid the very vitals of the system. The right of marriage among the clergy was indeed at once conceded, because the prohibition was not a necessary part of the discipline of the Church of Antioch. *The Syrians had no objection to be purged from every stain they had received from Rome*, and this probably was one; for though Antioch approved of celibacy, she did not enforce it upon the common clergy. They hated Rome—as well they might—but they had no idea of purging the errors of Antioch; and the Missionaries only deceived themselves when they spoke of helping them to return to their "primitive state, that they might again become a holy and vigorous church."

The real nature of that primitive state to which the Syrians were entreated to return should have been more accurately examined. The whole history of the Jacobite Syrian Church should have been studied, and their liturgies understood, as a necessary preliminary to the establishment of a Mission among the Jacobites of Travancore. Here then we can point out one cause of failure which operated from the very first, and probably for some years." ("Missionary Enterprise," pp. 100 and 101.)

23. We have in the above extract an express admission that your Missionaries exceeded the limit of reforms originally proposed and accepted by the C. M. S. and the Metran, and contemplated by Col. Munro. Reforms of errors crept in from the Roman Church were all that were originally thought of by all parties concerned. According to your living Missionaries, this Church was Jacobite at least since 1695. (Vide Dr. Richard's letter published in the *C. M. S. Intelligencer* for October 1902,) and according to your earlier Missionaries such as Collins and Chapman, it was so from the sixth century. Neither the C. M. S. nor Col. Munro had any design to alter the Jacobite character of the Church or its ancient liturgies and established doctrines. They never had the intention of disintegrating it or raising schisms in it. They expressly prohibited every attempt to amalgamate it with the Church of England or to interfere with its liberty to ordain rites and ceremonies. And yet, what were the procedures adopted by your earlier Missionaries and still pursued by your living agents? They desired to introduce the liturgy of the Church of England into the Syrian Church. (Hough's "History of Christianity in India," Vol. V. p. 386). When that was found impossible, they made a revision of the ancient liturgy and offered it for use in the Syrian Churches. (*Madras C. M. S. Records*, Vol. IV. pp. 60 and 118; Vol. V. p. 39.) When that too failed, they formed a branch of the Church of England consisting mainly of proselytes from the ancient Syrian Church, and also helped to raise schisms in it. "To alter the liturgy of a Church," writes the Rev. G. B. Howard, "is a matter of the gravest consequence, even when alterations are made under the sanction of proper authority, but that men in the position of

the Missionaries at Kottayam should tamper with and "modify" the liturgy of an independent Church, into communion with which they had been admitted by mere courtesy, is a height of presumption almost incredible." ("The Syrian Church of Malabar and their Liturgies," p. 105.) He writes again:—"The Missionaries built churches in close proximity to those of the Syrians, as at Kottayam, Mavelicara, Mallapalli, Collatta, and elsewhere; and persisted in a system of proselytizing, undeterred by the sentence of excommunication which were pronounced by the Metropolitan against all who joined them. They encouraged the people to disregard his injunctions, and not to fear his threats; they induced some of the Catanars (priests) to adopt their modified ritual.....and the lamentable spectacle of this new schism is continued to the present day." (Ibid p. 107).

24. To show how appalling the vagaries of your Missionaries were, I shall quote one more passage from an article written by an Anglican of Anglicans, Mr. John Kurien, B. A., B. C. E., M. E., an Assistant Engineer in the service of the Travancore Government, himself a Syro-Anglican, grandson of one of the earlier Syro-Anglican native pastors, and nephew of two of the living C. M. S. pastors. He writes from information received direct from the mouth of his grandfather who was one of the students of the College before the disruption of 1836:—"One of the Missionaries was in the habit of delivering lectures in the College. In one of his lectures addressed to an audience that consisted of deacons and lay students of the College, he vehemently denied the ever-virginity of the Blessed Mary, and contended that she was the mother of several children. When he returned home, the deacons applied to their Syriac Malpan for an elucidation of their doubt. The Malpan, of course, criticised the Missionary's lecture, and tried to prove that Mary was an ever-virgin. The Missionary, who had some cause of suspicion, suddenly returned to the College, and overhearing the Malpan's speech, stepped into the room and dismissed him then and there, saying 'either you or I must remain here.' The Malpan had to go home that very night." (See "Malankara Edavaka Pathrika," Vol. XI. No. 7, dated July 1902.)

25. Bearing the above facts in mind, I ask you again to read paras 2 to 21 of my former letter and say whether your Missionaries adhered to the terms of union and "religious renovation," contemplated by the Resident and reciprocally proposed and accepted by the C. M. S. and the Metran.

26. Again, you admit that the College was established by the Syrian Metran before the arrival of the Missionaries, (para 5 of the Memorandum.) According to the Rev. Mr. Fenn, "it is the College of the Syrian Church, not of the Mission." ("Missionary Enterprize," p. 112). The object of the College was "to instruct the Catanars and officiating priests among the Syrians in a complete knowledge of the Syriac language.....With the study of Syriac would of course be combined that of the scriptures and other religious books written in that language." (Col. Munro's letter quoted in para 3 of the award.) Now, "religious books" in the Syriac language were no doubt unrevised. There is no mention anywhere on the part of the founder of the College or persons who helped in its foundation, of a desire to revise the Syriac books or to use the College for the purpose of a revision. In other words, the education of the clergy in the doctrines and rituals of the Syrian Church as inculcated in their ancient Syriac books was the object of the establishment of the College. The first endowment of the College was a donation of Rs. 8,000 by the Travancore Government, granted in 1816, at the instance of Col. Munro. He had invited the C. M. S. Missionaries to work among the Syrians in 1815. ("Missionary Enterprize," p. 91.) It is therefore clear that the grant of Rs. 8,000 was made after Col. Munro had formulated the scheme of Missionary work among the Syrians. And yet, the grant was made for the express purpose of enabling the Syrians "to prosecute the study of the holy scriptures *according to the custom of their sect*," and not according to any scheme of revision, contemplated by Col. Munro, (award para 3.) This is a clear proof to my contention that in inviting the Missionaries, Col. Munro had no other design than to assist the Syrians in maintaining the ancient doctrines and customs of their church. He never thought of altering her established doctrines and rituals. He would never

Java sought the help of the C. M. S., if it was not because, as he himself writes, he was aware that the Missionaries were "sensible of the propriety of maintaining the integrity of the Syrian Church as a separate establishment, standing, as it has done for so many centuries, a bright monument of Christian Truth in the midst of the darkest scenes of idolatry and wickedness." ("Proceedings of the C. M. S. for Africa and the East, 20th year," pp. 172 and 173.) Such being the case, it must be assumed that the subsequent grants of Rs. 20,000 and the Munro Island estate, which, as you admit, were "endowments for the support of the Syrian College," could not have been designed for any purpose adverse to the avowed original object of the College itself and of its first endowment, granted by the same donor at the instance of the same Resident, unless you produce direct evidence to the contrary. As already shown, the inclusion of the names of the Missionaries in their title deeds is due to the then inability of the Syrians to undertake the responsibility of education alone, as well as to Col. Munro's conviction that your Missionaries would maintain the integrity of this Church.

27. I have already shewn in the above pages that your Missionaries departed from the terms of the trust and sought to do away with the liturgy and rituals which they were bound to maintain with the endowment in question. I can also show that they still abuse the proceeds of the endowment for purposes adverse to the designs of the donors. The C. M. S. College at Kottayam is the educational institution where the endowment is made use of for the alleged benefit of the Syrian Community, since the date of the award. Whether the system of your education conforms to the designs of the endower or of Col. Munro, let your own Missionaries and agents say. I shall first examine the Rev. R. Collins who was Principal of your College till about 1837 or 1858. Regarding the working of the College he deposes (though not on oath):—"Great pains were also taken, as you would suppose, in the explanation of the Christian doctrine, and in exposing the errors and superstitions both of the Syrians and the Roman Catholics." ("Missionary Enterprize," p. 151.) We have already heard from this very witness that the so-called errors

and superstitions of the Syrian Church against which he was conducting a crusade were not errors crept into this church from the Church of Rome, the removal of which alone was the reform contemplated by Col. Munro and the C. M. S.; and I have also shown in paras 14 and 15 of my previous letter that the so-called "errors and superstitions" of the Syrian Church were doctrines and practices more or less recognised and enforced by a not inconsiderable section of the divines of the Church of England.

28. Again, the same author records the result of his school work thus:—"Another thing I cannot resist mentioning, and that is, that I find the vast majority of the sons of Syrians—indeed I can point to no one exception, though no doubt as years pass on, some exceptions will manifest themselves—leave the college either as professed *Protestants in communion with the English Church*, or as decided members of the Reforming party in the Syrian Church," (p. 157). Is this, I ask, the system of maintaining "the integrity of the Syrian Church as a separate establishment," without "amalgamating it with the Church of England," and without interfering "with its liberty to ordain rites and ceremonies"?

29. My second witness is the Rev. C. A. Neve, who was also Principal of your College, but is now acting Principal of the C. N. Institution. In his published report of the College for the year 1883, he writes:—"In the *Revised Rules* of the College which has been issued during the past year, the alterations chiefly affect the scholarships and exhibitions (*i. e.* scholarships and exhibitions given from the income of the endowment in question).....The ages of candidates for both scholarships and exhibitions have been lowered one year. They have also been *confined to the boys of Syrian parentage attached to the Anglican Church*. It was thought that the time had now come, when those members of the Anglican Church, who are also of the Syrian community, were sufficiently numerous to furnish from their own body a supply of candidates able to pass the required examinations, and that whilst the College was for the benefit of *all* of Syrian descent, those attached to the Anglican Church had a special claim on it.

College under the control of and partly supported by the C. M. S." Will you contend that the framers of this revised rule and the members of the Missionary Conference who sanctioned it were thereby enforcing the designs of the endowments? This rule, it appears, was revoked after working a few years, not from the good will of the Missionaries, but because they took warning from the hostile attitude of the Syrians. Yet the revoking of the rule, much more than the enforcing of it, is a sure condemnation of such a policy and a clear proof, if proof is wanted, that the aim of the Missionaries was to disintegrate the Syrian Church, create schism therein, and enlarge their own communion by holding out offers of worldly help at the expense of a Church whose courtesy it was that first brought them into this country.

30. I shall next cite, as my third witness, the Rev. Jacob Chandy, one of the chaplains of Bishop Hodges. The Rev. J. H. Lord, a Missionary of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, working in Bombay, in an article published in the *Christian Patriot* of Madras, accused the C. M. S. of making proselytes from the Syrian Church. The Rev. Dr. W. J. Richards and the Venerable Archdeacon J. Caley totally denied the charge. The gist of a long reply from the pen of Mr. Chandy was to this effect:—It is always the practice of the C. M. S. to preach "against membership in a particular Church," and to diffuse education with "attractive scholarships" in such a way as to effect "reforms of doctrine and ritual," and lead the Syrians to discover "the superstitions of their own Church," and to find "the truth of God and rest for their souls" in the Anglican Church. (The *Christian Patriot* of July 19th, 1902).

31. I shall close the examination of witnesses after bringing two more persons in the witness-box. They are two native agents of the C. M. S. In their replies to Mr. Lord's article, they say that "those Syrians who come of their own accord are admitted in the Anglican Church," and that "such cases happen now and then." (The *Patriot* of April 19th and July 5th, 1902).

32. So far, I have clearly proved that the work of the C. M. S. in Travancore is in utter opposition to the intentions of the endowers and that the income of the endowment is utilised for purposes never dreamt of by the donors.

33. Another question raised in my letter, *viz.* that the endowments were intended solely to benefit the Jacobite Syrian Community is totally denied in your Memorandum. Your argument is that the passage in para 4 of the award, "the whole of the Syrian people," directly negatives "the suggested limitation of the class of persons intended to be benefited by the endowments;" that the expressions, "the Syrians," "the Syrians in general," "the Syrian Community," and "the whole of the Syrian Community," used in different parts of the award apply to the Syrian Community in a wider sense; and that when it is intended to limit the meaning to a narrower body, the expressions used are "the Syrian Church" or "the Syrian persuasion." You further say that there is nothing in the award to limit the expression "Syrian Community" to the Jacobite Syrian Community, and that at the dates of the endowment and the award, the Syrian community had no other head than the Metran (paras 60 and 61).

34. Let us see how far these arguments are borne out by facts. That the Syrian Community of Malabar was divided into two distinct sects in 1665, one adhering to the Roman Church under the Pope and the other the Jacobite Church owing allegiance to the Patriarch of Antioch, and that these divisions continued to exist on the dates of the endowment and the award are matters of history. In a national point of view, there were two distinct sections of Syrians under separate ecclesiastical heads. If the term "Syrian Community" as used in the reports and writings of Col. Munro and in the award had a wider meaning, as you would have us believe, your statement that the community had no other head than the Metran on the dates of the endowments and the award is an obvious error. On the other hand, if we understand the expressions as applicable only to one particular sect, the meaning is clear. The expression, "Metropolitan as the head of the *whole* Syrian Community" in para 3 of the award plainly indicates that the arbitrators were using the phrase "Syrian Community" to denote a narrower body, *viz* that portion of the community which recognised the Syrian Metropolitan as its head, which no doubt, was the Jacobite section. To convince one that the various titles quoted above were used by the

arbitrators as synonyms, one has only to read the award: I shall, therefore, rewrite below some of the paras in the award and show the bearing of the titles used in them.

Para 2. "Star Pagodas 8,000. This sum was vested in the Hon'ble Company's funds in the year 1808.....by the Rev. Mar Thoun, the then Bishop of the ancient *Syrian Church* of Malabar at the usual rate of interest.....This sum being the property of the *Syrian Community*.....the C. M. S. Society have no claim.....The disposal of the said interest shall in future be under the management of the Metropolitan for the time being of the *Syrian Church* conjointly with two others, an ecclesiastic and a respectable *Syrian* of the same *persuasion* to be selected by the *Syrian Community* itself."

35. You will see from this that the fund invested by the Bishop of the *Syrian Church* is the property of the *Syrian Community*, and that its trustees should be of *Syrian persuasion* selected by the *Syrian Community*. If any value were to be attached to your explanation of the titles, the fund should be regarded as the property common to the Jacobite Syrians, Romo-Syrians, the so-called Anglo-Syrians, Reformed Syrians, Salvationist-Syrians, Baptist-Syrians &c. &c., and though the trustees should be Jacobites, they must be selected by representatives of all the denominations named above. The special fund here referred to was recently the subject of an interpleader suit filed by the Secretary of State for India. Though the Court, by public notice, invited all interested persons to appear and contest the suit, it is a pity that your Missionaries did not consider it worth while to represent the claims of the Syro-Anglicans in the Court. Does it not amount to an admission on the part of your Missionaries that the expression "*Syrian Community*" in the award has a restricted sense? It is also worth remarking that the Court found that no other Syrian sect except the Jacobites has any right upon the fund, although, according to your explanation, these rights are vested in Syrians of various creeds and denominations.

36. Again, one more example from para 14 of the award.

"We award that the interest of the 8,000 Star Pagodas from the period of the sale of the College lands up to the present period be received by the Metran to be held in trust by him and two others, an ecclesiastic and a respectable layman of the *Syrian persuasion* to be selected by the *Syrians* themselves, for the exclusive benefit of the whole of the *Syrian Community*."

37. Here again, we have the expressions "*the Syrians*," "*the Syrian persuasion*," and "*the whole of the Syrian Community*." If no other section in the Syrian Community including the Anglo-Syrians pretend to have any claim to this fund, and if the Civil Court has found that the Jacobites alone are its beneficiaries, the only construction that you can give to the expressions, "*the Syrian*," and "*the whole of the Syrian Community*," is that the arbitrators did not mean to include the Syrians of every sect and creed under some of the titles and Jacobites alone under certain others. In other words, the various titles found in the award are used indiscriminately and without distinction, to mean one and the same sect, *viz.* the Jacobite Syrian Community, to the exclusion of all others. This view is fully borne out by the tenor of every para in the award. For example read paras 6, 7, 8, 9 &c.

38. You have made an attempt to prove your contention by reference to the expression "the whole of Syrian people," used in para 3 of the award in respect of Col. Munro's design in endowing Rs. 20,000. If "the whole of the Syrian Community" in paras 3 and 14 has only a restricted meaning, the other passage cannot have a wider sense. Besides, the passage, as used in the award, is simply an inference drawn by the arbitrators from the tenor of Col. Munro's letter. There is no evidence that Col. Munro or the Ranees of Travancore ever used this passage in the title deed. I am not prepared to accept the arbitrators' inference as infallible, when we have it from the mouth of Col. Munro himself that he had a different scheme. In one of his reports to the Government of Madras in the same year in which the grant of Rs 20,000 was made, after describing the various helps accorded to the Syrian Community through his influence, and after proposing certain further helps from the Government, he says:—"These measures would soon restore the Syrians to the high station which they formerly occupied. Education and knowledge would advance their industry and exertions.....Other advantages would also occur. The Roman Catholics, especially the *Syrian communities* still united to them, would be induced by the great melioration of the religion and temporal state of the Syrians, to join them." This means that

Col. Munro's intention was only to help that section of the community which owned the sway of the Metran. He also desired that the endowment should operate indirectly as a means to expand the Metran's Church and to amalgamate other sections in the community with his. What Church was it that he so ardently desired to expand indirectly by means of the endowments in question? Nobody will deny that that Church was the Jacobite Syrian Church. Your own Missionaries admit it. (*Vide "Missionary enterprize,"* p. 76, and Dr. Richard's letter in the *C. M. S. Intelligencer* for October 1902). Such being the case, the administration of the endowments in such a way as to disintegrate the ancient Syrian Church and raise schisms in it, is, no doubt, contrary to the intention of Col. Munro.

39. Keeping the above facts in mind, I humbly ask you to read again paras 40 to 51 of my former letter, and consider whether your Missionaries are guilty of breach of trust or not, under the various aspects discussed in those paras.

40. Another point in your memorandum, that I have to take exception to, is the allegation in paras 74 and 75. You indulge in priding that your Missionaries have been instrumental in forming a "Reforming Party" in the Syrian Church, recognised by the late Archbishop Benson of Canterbury: and you admit that it was the result of the work of your College with the proceeds of the endowment in question. Till a few years ago, the pride of your Missionaries was that they had been successfully establishing a branch of the Church of England in the midst of the Syrians, consisting of proselytes from the latter. The early volumes of the *Madras C. M. S. Records*, afford numerous examples to support this statement, in addition to the passage quoted from the Rev. Mr. Collin's work. But the Missionaries, for obvious reasons, are now reluctant to own their proselytising policy. Be that as it may, the point for consideration here is the admission of your instrumentality in bringing into existence the "Reformed Party," in other words, in creating a schism in an ancient sister Church.

41. "At the present time," writes Mr. Collins in page 76 of his work, "their bishops are consecrated by the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch alone," and he does not doubt that they were so from the sixth century, while Dr. Richards writes that this Church has been ever since 1655 Jacobite in communion with the See of Antioch, and that it is more than doubtful whether the Jacobites of Malabar and Mesopotamia "really intend to hold views different from the Church Catholic." What then, I ask, is the meaning of your boasted instrumentalit, in effecting a "Reformed Party" in the Syrian Church, if it is not an admission that you have successfully worked to raise a schism in a sister Church? The *Church Times*, in its issue of the 21st November, 1902 states with regard to Anabaptists:—"If they had regarded the parish Church as in any sense a 'Church,' even a corrupt erroneous 'Church,' they would have regarded it as schismatic and sinful to come out of it and to erect a new Church." If so, can any Catholic Christian applaud your works, on the face of your own admission that you deliberately do everything in your power to disintegrate the ancient Syrian Church, by encouraging schisms and supporting schismatics? Was the late Archbishop, whose alleged recognition of the status of the "Reforming Metran" is alluded to in your memorandum, aware that he was really recognising a schismatic sect? If he had known that, would he have recognised them against his own policy pursued among the Nestorians of Assyria?

42. The Nestorians are so ignorant and so fallen from the Truth that one of their priests said to Mr. Athleton Riley, whom Archbishop Benson deputed to ascertain their condition, "that by the power of God, the Blessed virgin Mary brought forth a man who was called Christ, that during his whole life, Christ was but a man, not God in any sense, but that when he worked miracles, it was by the power of God, as the prophets of old were enabled to perform them, that Christ was crucified and was buried being a mere man, and that afterwards God took him up to heaven, where he became God, and was no longer man, still existing in heaven simply God." ("Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission to the Assyrian Christians," p. 10). And yet, the purpose of the

Archbishop's Mission was "not to bring over these Christians to the communion of the Church of England—nor to alter their ecclesiastical customs and traditions, nor to change any doctrine held by them which are not contrary to that faith which the Holy Spirit, speaking through the Ecumenical Councils of the undivided Church of Christ, has taught as necessary to be believed by all Christians." Ibid. p. 42).

43. Did the Missionaries ever meet with such blasphemous theories among the Syrians of Malabar or any doctrine "contrary to that faith which the Holy Spirit, speaking through the Ecumenical Councils of the undivided Church of Christ, has taught as necessary to be believed by all Christians."? Is not then the endeavours of your Missionaries to induce Syrians to join the communion of the Anglican Church or to become schismatic "Reformers," sinful and un-Christian? Are not the funds and property of the Syrians utilised by your Missionaries for the attainment of such sinful results?

44. I shall next show the nature of the reforms brought about by the influence of your Missionaries at the sacrifice of Syrian endowments. The "Reforming Party" styling itself "The St. Thomas Syrian Church," is the body alluded to in your memorandum. It is a body consisting of members of different schools of religious views. You have taught them to interpret the Holy Scriptures according to the vagaries of each individual, and as many as have so read the Bible have brought forth as many teachings and doctrines. They invite adventurous preachers deputed by every sect of English Dissenters, to teach them religion; and they throw open their churches to all such persons. Among them were held conventions by a Tamil Evangelist David who said he belonged to no Church; by General Booth, the leader of the Salvation Army; by one Gregson, said to belong to Keswick Convention; and by one Nagel who claimed to represent the "Brother Mission." What that means I don't know. All these preachers were invited by the Reforming Metran and supported by his followers. As the result of such conventions and preachings, one party in the "Reforming" Section depnd upon

their self-righteousness, alleging that being saved, they are no more liable to commit sins; another party, headed by a priest, refuse infant baptism and indulge in rebaptising his followers in the river Pampa; a third party uphold the theories of the Salvation Army; while a considerable section deny the need of apostolic ministry, sacraments and baptismal regeneration. (See for instance a series of articles denying baptismal regeneration in Vols. V and VI of the now defunct organ of the Reformers). The wonder is that your Missionaries encourage them in such vagaries, the Rev. J. H. Bishop having himself graced by his presence one of these conventions held by Dissenters and having joined in the holy communion also.

45. The Jacobite liturgy contains prayers for "the faithful departed" and invocation of saints, of course, without worship or even use of images. The denial of these doctrines is, in the opinion of the Missionaries, the sole criterion of "reform." Even though a man may deny the need and efficacy of sacraments, priesthood, baptismal regeneration and other catholic doctrines, he is counted as a devout reformer, if he preaches against invocation of saints and prayers for the dead. The vagaries of the "Reforming Party" are so extravagant, appalling and unlimited, that the late Archdeacon Koshi, D. D., who was one of the best authorities in the Anglican diocese of Travancore and Cochin, in a public meeting of the Reformers themselves and in the presence of their bishops and leading members, compared them to an old and worn-out book whose leaves cannot be stitched together. This, I say, is the nature of the reforms effected by your Missionaries with the proceeds of the Syrian endowments; and yet you claim that you are carrying out the design of the donors to the very letter.

46. Compare these so-called reformers with the Jacobites and say who are the real reformers. The Jacobites stick to all catholic and ancient doctrines of the church and closely adhere to the teachings of "the Ecumenical Councils of the undivided Church." At the same time, they are ready to remove superstitious practices, if any. They encourage the reading of the Bible, but not its private interpretation except on the basis of Christian

Antiquity. They carry on Mission work, as far as their limited means allow, among the surrounding heathens. They open schools and educate their children. Your own Missionaries admit all these facts. (See Dr. Richard's letter in the *Gleaner* for February 1903.) I, therefore, leave it to you to judge who are the real reformers, conforming to the "religious renovation," contemplated by Col. Munro.

47. In speaking of the so-called Reformed Party, you have alluded to three bishops, all maintaining reforms. Of these, one is the Bishop recognised by a few thousands of Christians that follow the various schools of theological views, above referred to, the second is his suffragan, and the third is the Bishop of Tholiyur, a miniature diocese in British Malabar containing but two small churches with a congregation of about thirty families in each. He is a Jacobite of Jacobites in his persuasion, liturgy and rituals, holding even such old superstitious practices as the Jacobites have removed. The only difference is that the Patriarch of Antioch does not recognise the validity of his consecration and he, therefore, does not acknowledge the Patriarch's spiritual supremacy. It would appear from the tenor of your memorandum that his conservatism also is the result of the reforming labours of your Missionaries.

48. One word more about the working of your College. In para 67, you admit that Syriac was regularly taught for many years in your College, but that when the Indian Universities were established, it became necessary to alter the curriculum and discontinue the teaching of Syriac. This, I contend, is not a sufficient explanation for the breach of trust argued in paras 46 and 47 of my former letter. The Indian Universities do not demand the teaching of the scriptures. Will that justify your Missionaries, if they were to shut out the Bible from the College? The very fact that a portion of the income of the endowment was spent by your Missionaries for many years to cover the pay of a Syriac Malpan in your College, is a clear proof of your admission that the endowment was not intended by its donor for the general

use of the Syrian Community considered as a nation, but for the benefit of the Syrians taken as a church in which the study of Syriac, at least by the clergy, was indispensable.

49. The above remarks dispose of your arguments in respect of the object and working of the endowments. It only remains for me to prove the utter hollowness of your statement in para 65 of your Memorandum. You contend that the C. M. S. did not receive the full amounts adjudged to them in the award. You are entirely mistaken. On the other hand, you have received more than what was due to you under the award, and have so much robbed the Syrian Church of what was due to it. Your presumption appears to have originated from an error in the amount of one of the items adjudged to you. In para 36 of the Memorandum, you have entered a sum of Rupees 5170—0—4 as having been awarded to Mr. Bailey for payment of the arrears of salary due to College servants. But the actual sum in the award was not so many Rupees, but so many Chackrams (a Travancore coin) which, in British currency, amount only to Rupees 181 and a few annas. This sum was due to the servants and was accordingly paid to Mr. Bailey from the amount held in deposit in the Resident's treasury.

50. I shall next show that you have received a large sum in excess of what was adjudicated to you and that the Syrians were robbed of what was due to them.

51. According to the most reliable account, the total amount deposited in the Resident's treasury was Rupees 64731—11—4. To this sum was to be added uncollected arrears of rent due to the College from ryots, amounting to Rs. 8223—14—6 plus the value of paddy in store, Rs. 274—10—8.

52. The items adjudged to the C. M. S. by the arbitrators excluding the Munro Island estate were:—

		Rs.	As.	P.
(1)	Grant from the Travancore Ranees (award para 4)	20000	0	0
(2)	Subscriptions from Europeans (para 5).	14035	1	8

(3)	Proportionate share in the cash surplus of Rs. 6746-7-3. (para 19)...	4051	8	0	✓
(4)	Do. on the interest of the Star Pagodas for 1836, 37, & 38 (para 24)	1513	7	9	
	Total due to the C. M. S. from the deposit amount.	39600	1	3	
(5)	The cost of chapel, to be paid from the general fund (para 9).	500	0	0	✓
(6)	Loan due to the C. M. S., to be paid from the general fund (para 17). ...	2279	9	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	✓
	Total due to the C. M. S. from the general fund	2779	9	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	
(7)	Proportionate share in the uncollected arrears of rent (para 19). ...	510 $\frac{1}{2}$	8	7	
	Grant total due to the C. M. S. including their share in the uncollected arrears	4748 $\frac{1}{2}$	3	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	

53. This is exactly the amount received by the C. M. S. under a joint receipt dated 4th February 1841, signed by Mr. Bailey and the officiating Secretary to the Madras C. M. S. Committee. The amount in the bill of exchange drawn by Messrs. Arbuthnot and Co., dated 12th May 1841, on the Resident in Travancore and Cochin, also agrees with this sum. You cannot, therefore, contend for a moment that any sum adjudged to you remains unpaid. Unfortunately this is not the case with the Syrians. The items and amounts awarded to them are:—

		Rs.	AS.	P.
(1)	The Star Pagodas (para 2)...	10500	0	0
(2)	Ranee's donation (para 3) ...	8000	0	0
(3)	The sale proceeds of properties and jewels of former Metrans (para 11).	2960	2	3
(4)	Proportionate share in the cash surplus of Rs. 6746-9-3. (para 19). ...	2694	15	3 $\frac{1}{2}$
(5)	Do. in the interest of the Star Pagodas for 1835, 36 & 37 (para 24).	1006	8	3
	Total due to the Syrians from the deposit amount.	2516 $\frac{1}{2}$	9	9 $\frac{1}{2}$

(6) Proportionate share in the uncollected arrears of rent (para 19). . . . 3394 0 1²

Grand total due to the Syrians, including the share in the uncollected arrears. 2855 9 11

54. The amounts received by the late Mar Athanasius from the Resident's Treasury were :—

	Rs.	AS.	P.
(1) Bond for Star Pagodas.	10500	0	0
(2) The interest on do. for 1835 to 1837.	2520	0	0
(3) A balance in cash out of the deposit.	6080	0	0

Total received... 19100 0 0

Balance due to the Syrians 9455 9 11

55. The next question is how to account for this large deficit. There is no pie left in the Resident's Treasury. Where then is the amount gone? You will see from the above account that a sum of Rs. 5104 and odd formed the proportionate share of the C. M. S. in the uncollected arrears due to the College from ryots, and this amount was paid to them from the cash deposit in the Residency. Similarly another sum of Rs. 2779 ordered to be paid to the C. M. S. from the general fund was also deducted from the share allotted to the Syrians. The Syrian Church was in no wise bound to make good to the C. M. S. the amount due to them from ryots. If, however, any party could be held responsible for the arrears, it was the C. M. S. Missionaries who were in actual management of the endowments and in whose hands were all the accounts. In the same manner, the amounts ordered to be paid from the general fund should not have been charged upon one party alone. In the absence of a particular general fund, both parties had to bear those sums proportionately. By this unjust procedure of disbursement, the Syrians were robbed of a sum of Rs. 9455 in the aggregate, or Rs. 6061 excluding their share in the uncollected arrears; and the C. M. S. have been enriched by a like sum in excess of what was due to them under the award. If, as you contend, the award is to be taken as valid and final, are you not bound, in justice, to make good this sum to the Syrians?

56. I believe I have conclusively answered all the important points in your memorandum. The Syrian Church cannot rest satisfied with your unconvincing arguments. If no amicable settlement of the question can be arrived at, the only course open to them is to go to law, and in this determination, they are encouraged by valuable legal advice. It is needless for me to repeat that they are very anxious to avoid, if possible, a litigation with so eminent a body as the C. M. S. But your total denial of their just claims compels them to undertake that unbecoming procedure. However, since you have expressed a deep regret to be forced to litigation, and since in one of your letters addressed to our London Agent, you expressed a desire to have an interview with him, if he had any authority "to propose some other arrangement" than that which the Syrians claimed in my previous letter, the Syrian Association have thought it advisable, before they actually undertake a legal action, to bring certain new arrangements for the consideration of your Committee.

- (1) It may be asked why the Syrian Church and the C. M. S. cannot jointly administer the trust as they did in the last century. This, no doubt, would have been possible, had the Missionaries been keeping their original terms of union. But as matters now stand, this is rather impossible. I may, however, here state that we are perfectly willing to allow the endowment to remain in the hands of the C. M. S., provided it is devoted for the education of the Syrians in a school or college belonging to the Syrian Church, the right of the Missionaries being restricted to advise the Syrians in the management of the fund in that school or College, to check the accounts of the expenditure of the income of the endowments, and to interfere in it only in case the fund is squandered away or spent for purposes alien to the terms of the trust as explained in this letter.
- (2) Another alternative arrangement may also be proposed for the sake of a compromise. The trust endowments consist of a property and fund granted by the Travancore Ranees and money collected in England by your

Missionaries. Both sets were designed for the exclusive benefit of the Syrian Church. However, we may, if our proposal is accepted, forego our right to the latter set, *viz.* funds collected in England, provided the C. M. S. give up their claim to the former set.

(3) One more proposal. When the question was laid before an arbitration in 1840, the parties did not bind themselves by a formal document to abide by the decision of the arbitrators; and this failure was one of the reasons which induced the Court of Directors to annul the award. Circumstances have now undergone a vast change. The charges against your Missionaries are breaches of trust in various aspects which did not exist in 1840. In the absence of an amicable settlement of the present question, litigation is inevitable, which, besides entailing many serious difficulties and expenses on both sides, is damaging to the interests of Christianity and will detract us from the charity and brotherhood of Christ's Church. The Syrians are, therefore, willing to submit the present question to be decided by an arbitration and to bind themselves to abide by its decision, provided the C. M. S. also agree to it.

57. I wish it to be understood that the above proposals are made for the sake of a compromise, and that if the C. M. S. refuse to comply with any one of them, they shall not be taken as binding on the Syrian Community or legally affecting their right to the whole of the endowments, in case they are unfortunately obliged to take the question to a Court of Law.

58. I, therefore, humbly and earnestly request the C. M. S. Committee to be kind enough to consider the question with the light of this reply, and with a view to avoid the discredit which a litigation will bring upon the parties, to come to an amicable settlement, either by kindly recognising the claims of my church and community to administer the endowment independently of your Missionaries, or by conceding to any one of the proposals made in the above paras.

59. You will, I hope, pardon me if either in this or in my previous letter, I have used expressions which may appear disrespectful to your Society or your local agents. Allow me to assure you that it is far from my desire to cast unmerited imputation against the members of an eminent religious body. Whatever I have said was said in the interest of what I am perfectly convinced to be true and just.

"Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. It is like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard; that went down to the skirts of his garments; as the dew of Hermon, and as the dew that descended upon the mountains of Zion; for there the Lord commanded the blessings, even life for evermore."

Believe me,
Reverend Sir,
Your-most obedient servant,
E. M. PHILIP,
*Secretary to the Malabar
Jacobite Syrian Association.*

KOTTAYAM, TRAVANCORE, }
June 1903. }

